

been to push the questions of Evangelism within the Presbytery through our Corresponding Members, a list of whom is hereto attached. (See Appendix "B.") The effort has yielded most gratifying results, as can be seen from the following quotations from letters received.

One brother writes, "It is our purpose to have every church visited by at least two men, and a week's meeting held in each place. This plan was adopted at the suggestion of the Home Mission Committee of which I am chairman (he is our Corresponding Member also) and will be held under my direction. You may include this under the work of your committee as it will be upon the lines laid down by you." Another brother writes, "At the spring meeting of _____ Presbytery we voted to hire a Presbyterial Evangelist for one year, and sufficient funds were pledged to cover the expense of same. Other than this, no formed steps were taken along evangelistic lines, but we feel that this means a great deal for our Presbytery." The above are taken from a large number of letters received by the chairman, all of which indicate that the Presbyteries are taking hold of this work with the determination to push same vigorously.

While we believe in the large evangelistic campaigns, and especially the simultaneous evangelistic campaigns, we can not but feel that we can do our best service as a Church by pushing this work through our Presbyterial machinery, and thus reach the weakest part of our territory which is to a large extent untouched by the ordinary evangelistic campaign. Both plans should be pushed according to location and condition of work.

Steps have been taken to have the evangelistic responsibility and opportunity of the church emphasized in the conference at Montecle and Montreat during the coming summer. Through the co-operation and courtesy of the Supt. of Platform Work at Montecle, the Hon. Allen G. Hall one hour each day has been given to Evangelism during the Bible study week, with two of our best men, Rev. C. R. Hemphill and Rev. W. M. Anderson, on the program.

At Montreat, Dr. W. W. White, who is charged with the duty of planning the work, has given assurance of his purpose to emphasize evangelism, giving the theme an hour each day throughout the entire course, and bringing the program to a climax in a practical application of the teaching of the Bible to evangelistic preaching and effort.

During the month of March, your committee was invited to enter a conference with representatives of other Presbyterian bodies called to discuss the advisability of organizing a world-wide Evangelistic Campaign under the auspices of the different Presbyterian bodies of the world. The invitation was accepted and our Chairman attended the conference in the city of New York. Representatives were present from the Presbyterian churches in the U. S., the United Presbyterian Church, the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., and the Canadian Presbyterian Church through a message from her representative, Rev. Ralph Connor, D. D. After mature deliberation, it was unanimously decided that the time was at hand when a great evangelistic effort, world-wide in its scope, should be undertaken, and that in the providence of God, the Presbyterian Church is the one to lead in this great aggressive movement. That the General Assemblies of all the Presbyterian bodies of the world should be asked to authorize the organization of such an effort in 1910, and to this end appoint committees to work out details.

We would make the following recommendations:

I. That the plan of work as outlined above be approved, and that a vigorous campaign be waged in all the Presbyteries with the view of using the present machinery of the Church in a more aggressive Presbyterial evangelistic work.

II. That the Simultaneous Evangelistic Campaign plan of work be commended, and the churches be urged to organize such campaigns wherever possible.

III. Whereas there seems to be an increasing interest on the part of Presbyterians throughout the world in evangelistic work, and, Whereas God has blessed our own Church in its effort in days gone by, and is continuing to bless her, and, Whereas, there are indications everywhere of special awakenings, and of God's special willingness to bless us as a people, it is suggested that the General Assembly, with permission of the Evangelistic Committee, to be appointed to move in harmony with other General Assemblies appointing such Evangelistic Committees toward a world-wide Presbyterian movement, and that from our Committee, a special committee of five should be appointed to consider the whole question, to correspond with the officials of other General Assemblies, to co-operate with committees already in existence and appointed like our own, and be prepared at the next General Assembly to put into operation such a movement along evangelistic lines as might mean the uplift of the entire Christian world.

IV. That a new committee be appointed, the members to live near enough to insure regular meetings, and that the Corresponding

Members provided for in the plan of work be urged to a diligent performance of the duties assigned.

V. That the Assembly set apart one of her strongest men to the work of leading this great movement in our Church, providing him a competent support, and assuring him of her sympathy and prayers.

The committee as at present constituted is as follows:

Rev. Chas. R. Nisbet, Chairman, Nashville, Tenn.

Rev. A. B. Curry, D. D., Memphis, Tenn.

Rev. W. M. Anderson, D. D., Nashville, Tenn.

Rev. C. R. Hemphill, D. D., Louisville, Ky.

Mr. W. H. Raymond, Nashville, Tenn.

Dr. A. J. A. Alexander, Spring Station, Ky.

The report on the Bible Cause was read.

The judicial case of Young vs. the Synod of Kentucky, involving the questions about the transfer of Central University to a self-perpetuating Board of Trustees, was then taken up. We here present in one mass a summary of the debates which extended at intervals during two or three days.

Dr. H. A. White thought the duty of jority report of the Judicial Committee on the case before the Assembly be adopted, and spoke to this motion. He was followed by Col. Bullitt, counsel for the Synod.

Dr. H. S. White thought the duty of the Assembly is to consider this case. The Synod of Kentucky admits that Central University has been lost to the Church and that the Synod consented thereto. The University has been the property of the Kentucky Synod for twenty-three years, and has become a part of the Assembly's system of education. The Assembly has a right to inquire as to whether the synod was justified in surrendering the University, and whether, in so doing, serious injury was done to the Assembly. Dr. White thought that the plea to the jurisdiction made by the commissioners of the Synod of Kentucky appeals to the civil law and ignores the church law.

A protest signed by Col. B. H. Young, and Dr. C. W. Sommerville, against the circulation in the Assembly of a pamphlet containing argument on the judicial case to come up before the Assembly, was ordered to be filed. It states that this pamphlet was circulated among the worshippers during the singing of the doxology on Saturday morning, just prior to the address of Rev. Dr. James Orr, and some days in advance of trial. It complains that such a proceeding is "unusual and unfair," and in direct conflict with the action of the Assembly of 1880, when a similar printed document was circulated in the Assembly in advance of a trial.

Col. Bullitt objected, saying:

"When the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Col. Young) begins to make the sort of protest which we hear at this time—a protest against methods which he chooses to decry as improper—to those who know him in Kentucky, it can cause only a smile."

Immediately there were objections against the speaker's use of personalities. Mr. Bullitt blandly replied that the allegations in the complaint are infinitely more personal in its reflections.

The Assembly voted that the protest be filed.

Col. Bullitt proceeded to show why the majority report could not be accepted. His argument was a legal statement in the main. He contended that the As-

sembly had before it a question of constitutional law, of procedure, of jurisdiction, and ultimately of civil law. He said that Mr. Young and others had no right to bring a complaint because the Book of Church Order prescribes that a disagreeable or unjustifiable decision is the only ground for a complaint. No decision has been made, no decision is extant. The charter powers involved in the controversy arose from the laws of Kentucky, and not from the Church. He cited the threat of the complainants to force the matter into the courts and hinted of the dangers with which such a course was fraught to the Assembly.

He described certain allegations in the complaint as untrue and a slander. He informed the Assembly that a condition precedent to the formation of the charter and subscription of the University was that there should be no ecclesiastical control.

During the course of the argument, Dr. C. W. Grafton was given the floor to read the agreement between the Synod of Kentucky and the Assembly, made in 1867, which reserved to the Synod its legal right of property.

The majority report as amended by Dr. White was adopted.

Resolved, That the report of the majority of the Judicial Committee be adopted, but this action shall not be construed as determining that the General Assembly has jurisdiction of the complaint involved, but that the question of the merit of the complaint and the question of jurisdiction shall be argued together in the time and order set forth in the majority report.

The clerk read a remaining part of the record in the case of the complaint against the Synod of Kentucky.

On the next morning, Rev. C. W. Sommerville, one of the complainants, addressed the Assembly and said it is necessary to determine what is the Central University case, what are the issues involved, and thirdly, what is the remedy for the wrong complained of. He sketched the history of the institution. The interests involved are property to the value of \$800,000 and an annual income of about \$35,000, with 700 students. The Carnegie foundation for teachers was taken up.

In order to take advantage of this foundation the Synod of Kentucky had proposed that hereafter the trustees who had been appointed by the two Synods, be made a self-perpetuating body. This action was taken by the Synod of Kentucky. Notice of complaint had been filed to the Assembly at Greensboro, N. C., last. In spite of the pending of this complaint the charter was amended, and the institution was made independent of the Synods. He charged that this action in making the University independent has diverted a trust, and moreover, that the rehearing ordered by the General Assembly in 1908 had been a prejudiced affair on the part of the Synod of Kentucky.

Col. B. H. Young followed for the complainants. He challenged his opponents to give the reason for the transfer of the institution from the control of the Presbyterians. He declared that "the Synod of Kentucky has divorced Central University, and has taken our money, too." The act was characterized as unjustifiable, violating a pledge to the contributors. He maintained that the Synod of Kentucky could not perform a civil act, and that as its doings must be ecclesiastical they